UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,921	04/26/2001	Alan R. Peterson	P1403USC2	3534

45217   7590   07/07/2009
APPLE INC./BSTZ
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER
VO, TED T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2191	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/07/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _22 April 2009_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _19-21 and 23-57_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _19-21 and 23-57_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the claims filed on 04/22/2009.

Claims 19-21, 23-57 remain pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

2.   This is in response to the argument remarks filed on 04/22/2009. Applicants submitted Hardman's reference allows a human user to select objects within hierarchy view, and does not show determining automatically by a computer in response to receiving from the user events.

Examiner response: It should be noted that the recitation in the claim 19 and other independent claims, as that, "*receiving one or more user events during the development of the software content*; *determining,* <u>*automatically by the computer system in response to receiving the one or more user events*</u>", requires the events of a user in a development process. The limitation barely says *determining ...* <u>*in response to receiving the one or more user events*</u>; thus, it reads on any act done by a computer after the event is read by the computer. In Hardman (sec. 4 and its subsections), the manner of "auto" is done by computer, the determination is done by a program that characterizes as playing such as playing a selected node or child nodes of the hierarchical view. It should be noted that an event even is determined automatically by a computer, it cannot present a novel over the

determination of a user, since the auto is only the substitution of a manual act by taking advantage of programming.

Applicants add newly limitation as generating summarizing, as submitted in the claim 23 and other independent claims. However, in light of the specification, it merely describes as a removal of redundant actions. Thus, the discussion in the section 4, shows that the multimedia authoring allows generating a table of contents by a user; the multimedia authoring provides the type of information, multimedia presentation, notes, in which the user with the authorizing tool total controls the selection of nodes that are chosen to play. It is inherently show the user in the visual manner the summary in the multimedia history, and thus the user can review and select, thus eliminate the redundant nodes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 19-21, 23-39, 40-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Hardman et al., "Structure Multimedia Authoring", Proceedings of the first

ACM International Conference on Multimedia, Pages: 283-289, August 1993.

<u>As per claim 39</u>: Hardman discloses, *An apparatus for recording and reviewing actions*

performed during development of content created using a tool on a computer system

having a processor and memory, said apparatus comprising: a user interface means for

receiving user events which occur during development of content; and a recorder module

<u>comprising hardware</u> coupled to receive user events from said user interface means, said

recorder module determining <u>automatically in response to receiving the user events</u>

which events and sequences of events constitute actions and recording those actions if a

user preference specifies that those actions are to be recorded (See sec. 4.3), *said*

recorder module capable of recording an explanation for each individual action, said

explanations being recorded in a manner which associates a recorded explanation of a

recorded action with the recorded action. Start at p. 285, see sec. 4, and its subsections,

See Figures 2-3, and 7.

<u>As per Claim 19</u>: Hardman discloses,

A method for recording and reviewing actions performed during development of software

content created using a tool on a computer system having a processor and memory, said

method comprising:

receiving one or more user events during the development of the software content (See

Figure 3, Walking route/playing order of nodes. notes: events);

determining, <u>automatically by the computer system in response to receiving the one or</u>

<u>more user events,</u> which events and sequences of events constitute actions (see p. 286,

left column: walking route sequence, within hierarchy view, the author can select any

object); ***determining, by the computer, whether an explanation accompanies an action***

(see p. 286, left column, note names, explicit duration, comment. See right column, table

of contents); ***recording the determined actions during the development of the software***

content if a user preference specifies that the determined actions are to be recorded

(See 4.3: "allows the author to play any part..; select node, etc.); *and*

recording the determined explanations such that a recorded explanation of a recorded

action is associated with the recorded action. (See sec. 4.3).

<u>As per Claim 20</u>: Hardman discloses,

> *receiving a user request for playback of recorded actions* (Figure 3: places);

> *accessing recorded actions and associated recorded explanations; and*

> *playing back recorded actions and any associated recorded explanations.*

(See Figure 3, Playing order of nodes).

<u>As per Claim 21</u>: Hardman discloses,

determining whether as explanation accompanies an action includes prompting a user

for an explanation with respect to an action being recorded. (See sec. 4.3)

<u>As per claim 47</u>: Incorporated with the rejection of claim 19, Hardman discloses *wherein*

recorded actions are actions that do not affect the content because the specifying actions

such as in the table do not effect any content.

As per claim 23: Hardman discloses,

displaying a starting state of multimedia content (See Figure 1, p. 285, see Figure 2, the root; see Figure 7, from beginning, to end);

determining automatically, by the computer which recorded actions satisfy a specified arbitrary criteria; (See p. 286. sec. 4.1.2; see Figures 3-4: places, for example, specifying a table of contents, for example, specifying Canal1, canal2, etc. , see sec. 4.3, allow to select which channels; see sec. 4.3, allow the author to play any part of the presentation);

identifying <u>automatically, by the computer,</u> a plurality of redundant determined recorded actions;

<u>summarizing automatically, by the computer, the plurality of redundant determined recorded actions to generate a summarized determined recorded action; replacing automatically, by the computer,</u> the plurality of redundant determined recorded actions with <u>the</u> summarized determined recorded action; (in light of the spec: it describes as a removal of redundant actions. See the sec. 4.3, shows a user of the authorizing tool controls the selection of nodes that are chosen to play; user can review and select, thus eliminate the redundant nodes)

and playing back a sequence of only those determined recorded actions in chronological order on an output device during a development of content (and See Figure 3, it is playing the order of placing nodes using walking routes; also see sec. 4.1.2).

As per claim 24: Hardman discloses the claim. See rationale as addressed in the claim 19.

As per claim 25: Hardman discloses the claim. See Figure 1, and sec. 4; furthermore, see rationale as addressed in the claim 19.

As per claim 26: Hardman discloses, *A computer-readable storage medium having stored thereon executable computer program instructions, the executable computer program instructions including an action class list and, when executed by a digital processing system, causing the system to perform a method for playback of actions from the action class list, wherein:*

the action class list comprises a plurality of action class description fields (See Figure 3, playing order of nodes), *each action class description field having a first field containing data which specifies a particular action class and a second field containing data which specifies a generic explanation of the class action specified in the corresponding first field, wherein the action class list is used during playback of actions , during a development of content, to identify* automatically, by the digital processing system, *a plurality of redundant actions,* to summarize, automatically, by the digital processing system, the plurality of redundant actions to generate a summarized action, *to replace the plurality of redundant actions*

with a summarized action (See rationale addressed in claim 23) *and to determine an explanation associated with the action class of the action and to accompany the played back action with the determined explanation* (See Figure 7, e.g., the information in the boxes relates to a recording action Canal2, as selected from Walking route of Figure 3.

As per claim 27: Hardman discloses, *A computer-readable storage medium as defined in claim 26 wherein said second field identifies a software routine capable of producing an explanation based upon properties of a recorded action.* See Figure 7.

As per claim 28: Hardman discloses the claim. See related rationale addressed in Claim 23.

As per claim 29: Hardman discloses, *The method of claim 28, wherein: at least one action from said recorded actions is accompanied by an explanation and said playing back further comprises playing back any associated recorded explanations along with recorded actions.* See p. 288, sec. 4.3; see Fig. 7.

As per claim 30: Hardman discloses the claim. See related rationale addressed in Claim 23.

As per claim 31: Hardman discloses, *The computer-readable storage medium of claim 30, wherein: at least one action from said recorded actions is accompanied by an explanation and said playing back further comprises playing back any associated recorded explanations along with recorded actions.* See p. 288, sec. 4.3, see Fig. 7.

As per claim 32: Hardman discloses the claim. See rationale addressed in Claim 19 above.

As per claim 33: Hardman discloses the claim. See rationale addressed in Claim 20 above.

As per claim 34: Hardman discloses, *The apparatus of claim 32, wherein: said playback is based on determining automatically which recorded actions satisfy a specified arbitrary criteria.* See Figures 2-3, placing of notes is arbitrarily selected by the author.

As per claim 35: Hardman discloses the claim. See rationale addressed in Claim 19 above.

As per claim 36: Hardman discloses the claim. See rationale addressed in Claim 19 above and furthermore see Figures 1-3, and sec. 4.

As per claim 37: Hardman discloses the claim. See rationale addressed in Claim 20.

As per claim 38: Hardman discloses, *The computer-readable <u>storage</u> medium of claim 36, wherein: said determining comprises determining which events and sequences of events constitute actions by applying one of a plurality of granularities, said one of a plurality of granularities being selected based on criteria, whereby said applied one of a plurality of granularities varies depending on the criteria.* See Figures 1-3.

As per claim 40: Hardman discloses *The computer-readable storage medium of claim 23, wherein the specified criteria is a user specified criteria* (See p. 286. sec. 4.1.2; see Figures 3-4: places, for example, specifying a table of contents, for example, specifying Canal1, canal2, etc. , see sec. 4.3, allow to select which channels; see sec. 4.3, allow the author to play any part of the presentation);

As per claims 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46: See related rationale in claim 40 above.

As per claim 48: Incorporated with the rejection of claim 23, Hardman discloses *wherein*

recorded actions are actions that do not affect the content because the specifying actions

such as in the table do not effect any content.

As per claims 49-57: See related rationale in claim 48 above.

Conclusion

5.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than

SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ted T. Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3706.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM to 4:30PM. If attempts to reach the

examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Y. Zhen can be

reached on (571) 272-3708.

The facsimile number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is the Central Facsimile number 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should

be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100. Information regarding the

status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information

Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the

PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to

the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197

(toll-free).

TTV
June 26, 2009

/Ted T. Vo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2191